



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,340	12/13/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10008222-1	6165

7590 12/09/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

MURPHY, DILLON J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/021,340	SIMPSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Dillon J. Murphy	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**DOUGLAS Q. TRAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

*Tran*

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the amendment filed on September 26, 2005.
- Claims 1, 2, and 4-27 are pending. Claim 3 is canceled.
- Amendments to the specification are acknowledged and accepted.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yuasa et al. (US 5878198), hereafter referred to as Yuasa.

Regarding claim 1, Yuasa teaches a method practiced by a printing device for generating a form, the method comprising:

Receiving with the printing device data to be included in a form to be printed (Yuasa, fig 19, wherein data "D" is received by the printing device);

Merging the received data with static form data on the printing device (Yuasa, fig 19, blank form data "F" and form data "D" are sent to the printer to be merged and printed); and

Printing the received data and the static form data as a hard copy of the form (Yuasa, fig 19, overlay printing prints form. Static form is electronic data, not a preprinted form, shown in col 15, ln 48-50).

Regarding claim 5, claim 5 recites identical features as claim 1 except that claim 5 is a system claim. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 5. Applicant's attention is directed to fig 19 of Yuasa disclosing a printer, and also fig 3, #311, page printer.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 4, and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuasa et al. (US 5878198), LeClair et al. (US 6,636,891), and Pennell et al. (US 6910179), hereafter referred to as Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell.

Regarding claim 2, which depends from claim 1, Yuasa teaches a method practiced by a printing device for generating a form comprising receiving printing data by the printer, merging the received data and the static form data, and printing the printing data and the static data, as explained above in the rejection of claim 1. Yuasa does not disclose expressly a method wherein receiving data comprises receiving data

with a web-based form processing service. LeClair, however, teaches a method of receiving data by a web-based service hosted by a printer (LeClair, col 7, ln 55-59, printer hosts processing in embedded server, and col 8, ln 1-3, user invokes a browser connected to internet to submit information).

Yuasa and LeClair are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of printing systems and data control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of LeClair comprising receiving data by a web based service hosted by a printer with the method of Yuasa comprising generating a form comprising receiving printing data by the printer, merging the received data and the static form data, and printing the printing data and the static data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow multiple computer workstations or personal computers to share input and output devices (LeClair, col 1, ln 17-20).

The combination of Yuasa and LeClair teaches a method practiced by a printing device for generating a form comprising receiving printing data by the printer via a web-based service, merging the received data and the static form data, and printing the printing data and the static data. The combination of Yuasa and LeClair does not disclose expressly a method wherein the form processing is web-based. Pennell, however, teaches a method for inputting form data via a browser (Pennell, col 2, ln 11-12).

Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell are combinable because they are from a similar field of endeavor of data processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of Pennell comprising web-based form processing with the combination of Yuasa and LeClair comprising a method practiced by a printing device for generating a form comprising receiving printing data by the printer via a web-based service, merging the received data and the static form data, and printing the printing data and the static data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow any user regardless of their location to access the form processing features as taught by Yuasa and LeClair. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pennell with the combination of Yuasa and LeClair to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Regarding claim 4, which depends from claim 1, the combination of Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a method practiced by a printing device for generating a form further comprising storing an electronic copy of the form in a personal imaging repository of a user that initiated printing of the form, the personal imaging repository being remote from the printing device (Yuasa, col 15, ln 48-50, wherein form data is stored in an ASU, or auxiliary storage unit, #308 of fig 3, showing storage location remote from printing device. Additionally, it is well known in the art that a user may save a copy of a webpage onto their own computing device as per the teachings of using a browser according to LeClair and Pennell).

Regarding claim 6, which depends from claim 5, claim 6 recites identical features as claim 2 except that claim 6 is a system claim. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 2 are equally applicable to claim 5. Applicant's attention is directed to fig 19 of Yuasa disclosing a printer, and also fig 3, #311, page printer.

Art Unit: 2624

Additionally, see fig 3 of LeClair, showing I/O device (printer) #350 and server #310 along with col 7, ln 54-59, wherein printer may contain an embedded server.

Furthermore, see fig 3 of Pennell, disclosing browser #303 on user computer #304.

Regarding claim 7, which depends from claim 5, claim 7 recites identical features as claim 4 except that claim 7 is a system claim. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 4 are equally applicable to claim 7. Applicant's attention is directed to fig 19 of Yuasa disclosing a printer, and also fig 3, #311, page printer.

Additionally, see fig 3 of LeClair, showing I/O device (printer) #350 and server #310 along with col 7, ln 54-59, wherein printer may contain an embedded server.

Furthermore, see fig 3 of Pennell, disclosing browser #303 on user computer #304.

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a printing device comprising:

Hard copy generation hardware (Yuasa, fig 3, page printer #311, and fig 19, printer. Also see fig 3 of LeClair, showing I/O device (printer) #350 and server #310 along with col 7, ln 54-59, wherein printer may contain an embedded server);

A processing device (LeClair, col 5, ln 25-38, wherein printer comprises controller shown in fig 4, wherein controller comprises processor #406); and

Memory including an embedded network server (LeClair, printer of LeClair comprises embedded network server, col 7, ln 54-59. Network server is stored in memory of controller, col 5, ln 39-57), the server hosting a form processing service (Pennell, col 2, ln 11-12, form processing occurs in browser as hosted by printer of LeClair) configured to merge data received with static form data and print the received

Art Unit: 2624

data the and static form data as a hard copy form (Yuasa, fig 19, blank form data "F" and form data "D" are sent to the printer to be merged and printed).

Regarding claim 9, which depends from claim 8, the combination of Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a printing device wherein the form processing service includes logic configured to present a form processing website to a user with which the received data can be provided (LeClair, col 7, ln 55-59, server (#310 of figure 3) may be embedded in printer. In col 6, ln 36-38, server is coupled to display, wherein display presents browser to user. Additionally, see col 2, ln 44-60 of Pennell, wherein a browser is taught to display the web-based server features of LeClair, and wherein the logical browser programs present a form processing website to a user (Pennell, fig 4) so that the printer may receive data).

Regarding claim 10, which depends from claim 8, the combination of Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a printing device wherein the form processing service includes logic configured to store a copy of a form in a personal imaging repository of a user that initiated printing of the form, the personal imaging repository being remote from the printing device (LeClair, col 6, ln 50-56, printer contains memory for storing images and programs. Also see Yuasa, fig 3, wherein ASU (Auxiliary Storage Unit) #308 is provided to store forms. Additionally, it is well known that a user operating a browser as disclosed by Pennell may save a copy of the form on their computing device, i.e. logic is provided to store a copy of a form in personal imaging repository remote from a printing device).



Claims 11-13, 15, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Al-Hussein (US 5,809,167) and Yuasa et al. (US 5878198), hereafter referred to as Al-Hussein and Yuasa.

Regarding claim 11, Al-Hussein teaches a method practiced by a printing device for printing a document comprising the steps of accessing document imaging data from at least one store via a network with the printing device (Al-Hussein, col 6, ln 12-16, files are accessed from network disk. Additionally, the actions are performed by the printer itself, which comprises a general purpose computer, col 5, ln 53-60. Thus, any actions performed on any general purpose computer may be performed within the personal imaging computer system (PICS) of Al-Hussein), retrieving the document imaging data from the at least one store, and printing the document imaging data with the printing device (Al-Hussein, col 6, ln 22-25, method comprises retrieving the document image and associated text file and printing at a printer). Al-Hussein does not disclose expressly the method of printing form data, although form data falls under the category of a document. Yuasa teaches a method practiced by a printing device for printing a form comprising merging the retrieved form imaging data with the static form data on the printing device (Yuasa, fig 19, blank form data "F" and form data "D" are sent to the printer to be merged and printed).

Al-Hussein and Yuasa are combinable because they are in the same field of endeavor of printing systems and data control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of merging the retrieved form imaging data with the static form data on the printing device

Art Unit: 2624

of Yuasa with the methods of Al-Hussein comprising accessing, retrieving, and printing document data by the printer. The motivation for doing so would have been to always print the most current form data by accessing data from a network store, as well as to retrieve a document image and text file for later printing (Al-Hussein, col 3, ln 51-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yuasa with Al-Hussein to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

Regarding claim 12, which depends from claim 11, the combination of Al-Hussein and Yuasa further teaches a method wherein the at least one store comprises a graphic store and a composition store (Al-Hussein, col 7, ln 39-51, images and text are stored in memory).

Regarding claim 13, which depends from claim 11, the combination of Al-Hussein and Yuasa further teaches a method wherein the at least one store is associated with an imaging service stored on the printing device that is configured to facilitate form completion (Al-Hussein, col 7, ln 39-51, CPU associated with imaging service controls program instruction sequences which manipulate document images. Word processor, image processing, and spreadsheet processing, a programs for form processing, are stored in the PICS of Al-Hussein, col 5, ln 60-67).

Regarding claim 15, which depends from claim 11, the combination of Al-Hussein and Yuasa further teaches a method wherein accessing form imaging data comprises accessing imaging data through use of an imaging extension (Al-Hussein, col 7, ln 39-51, CPU associated with imaging service controls program instruction sequences which

access and manipulate document images. Program of Al-Hussein provides generating and mapping of client instructions).

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Al-Hussein and Flannery further teaches a printing device, comprising:

Memory (Al-Hussein, in figure 5, Personal Imaging Computer System #20, "PICS," comprises CPU #60, RAM Memory #79, ROM #77, and disk storage #75 for storing and executing instructions for image processing, col 7, ln 61-67 and col 8, ln 1-9), including logic configured to:

Access form imaging data (As explained in the rejection of claim 11, the document of Al-Hussein covers the forms as taught by Yuasa) from at least one store via a network (Al-Hussein, col 6, ln 12-16, files are accessed from network disk. Files are stored in server #41 on network disk #42, while being accessed via network #31 in figure 4. Also see Yuasa, fig 19, wherein data "D" is accessed by the printing device, wherein in data "D" is stored in an auxiliary storage unit ASU, col 15, ln 48-51),

Retrieve the form imaging data, merge the received data with static form data (Yuasa, fig 19, blank form data "F" and form data "D" are sent to the printer to be merged and printed), and print the form imaging data along with the static form data as a hard copy form (Al-Hussein, col 6, ln 22-25, method comprises retrieving the document image and associated text file and printing at a printer. Printer is shown as printer, #45, in figure 4. See also Yuasa, fig 19, overlay printing prints form. Static form is electronic data, not a preprinted form, shown in col 15, ln 48-50).

Regarding claim 25, which depends from claim 24, the combination of Al-Hussein and Yuasa further teaches a printing device wherein the logic comprises a network-based printing service (Al-Hussein, figure 4, printers #45, #20, and #56 are connected to LANs #32 and #46, respectively).

Claims 14, 16, 17-23, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Al-Hussein (US 5,809,167) and Yuasa et al. (US 5878198), LeClair et al. (US 6,636,891), and Pennell et al. (US 6910179), hereafter referred to as Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell.

Regarding claim 14, which depends from claim 13, the combination of Al-Hussein and Yuasa teaches a method practiced by a printing device for printing a form comprising accessing form image data, retrieving the form imaging data, merging the retrieved form imaging data with static form data, and printing the form imaging data along with the static form data as a hard copy, wherein at least one store is associated with an imaging service stored on the printing device. Although the combination of Al-Hussein and Yuasa teaches a method wherein the PICS is a general purpose computer combined with a printer connected to a network, the combination does not disclose expressly wherein the imaging service comprises a network-based form processing service hosted by the printing device. LeClair, however, teaches a method of hosting a network-based imaging service hosted by a printer (LeClair, col 7, ln 55-59, printer hosts processing in embedded server, and col 8, ln 1-3, user invokes a browser connected to internet to submit and receive information).

Al-Hussein, Yuasa and LeClair are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of printing systems and data control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of LeClair comprising hosting a network based imaging service hosted by a printer with the method of Al-Hussein and Yuasa comprising accessing form image data, retrieving the form imaging data, merging the retrieved form imaging data with static form data, and printing the form imaging data along with the static form data as a hard copy, wherein at least one store is associated with an imaging service stored on the printing device. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow multiple computer workstations or personal computers to share input and output devices (LeClair, col 1, In 17-20).

The combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, and LeClair teaches a method practiced by a printing device for generating a form comprising accessing form image data, retrieving the form imaging data, merging the retrieved form imaging data with static form data, and printing the form imaging data along with the static form data as a hard copy, wherein at least one store is associated with an imaging service stored on the printing device, and wherein the imaging service comprises a network-based processing service hosted by the printing device. The combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa and LeClair does not disclose expressly a method wherein the form processing is web-based. Pennell, however, teaches a method for inputting form data via a browser (Pennell, col 2, In 11-12).

Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell are combinable because they are from a similar field of endeavor of data processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of Pennell comprising web-based form processing with the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, and LeClair comprising a method practiced by a printing device for generating a form comprising accessing form image data, retrieving the form imaging data, merging the retrieved form imaging data with static form data, and printing the form imaging data along with the static form data as a hard copy, wherein at least one store is associated with an imaging service stored on the printing device, and wherein the imaging service comprises a network-based processing service hosted by the printing device. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow any user regardless of their location to access the form processing features as taught by the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, and LeClair. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pennell with the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, and LeClair to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Regarding claim 16, which depends from claim 15, the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a method practiced by a printing device for printing a form, wherein the imaging extension comprises part of a user browser (LeClair, col 8, ln 1-3, printing commands are issued from a browser over the internet. Also see Pennell, fig 4, wherein the browser is used for form processing. It is well known that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 17, which depends from claim 15, the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair and Pennell teaches a method practiced by a printing device for printing a form wherein the imaging extension comprises part of a network-based printing service hosted by the printing device (LeClair, col 7, ln 57-65, instructions issued to retrieve documents are sent by browser, col 8, ln 1-3, which is hosted by printing device, in network connected to printer figure 3, I/O device #350 connected to network #300, browser is viewed in display #322, connected to server #310 and network. Also see col 9, ln 30-34 of LeClair, wherein a print request printing the forms as taught by Yuasa, may be received by the network based printing device. It is well known in the art that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 18, which depends from claim 17, the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a method wherein the printing service is hosted by an embedded server of the printing device (LeClair, col 7, ln 55-59, printer hosts processing in embedded server. Processing occurs in server in printer to process images comprising documents and forms).

Regarding claim 19, the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a system stored on a printing device for printing a form, the system comprising:

Means provided on the printing device for accessing form imaging data form at least one store via a network (Al-Hussein, col 6, ln 12-16, files are accessed from network disk. Files are stored in server #41 on network disk #42, while being accessed via network #31 in figure 4. Also see Yuasa, fig 19, wherein data "D" is received by the

printing device, wherein in data "D" is accessed from auxiliary storage unit ASU, col 15, ln 48-51);

Means for merging the retrieved form imaging data with static form data of the printing device (Yuasa, fig 19, blank form data "F" and form data "D" are sent to the printer to be merged and printed). Also see Yuasa, col 16, ln 15-20, wherein imaging data and static form data are merged in the printer); and

Means for printing the form imaging data along with the static form data as a hard copy form (Yuasa, fig 19, overlay printing prints form. Static form is electronic data, not a preprinted form, shown in col 15, ln 48-50. Also see Al-Hussein, col 6, ln 22-25, wherein the method comprises retrieving the document image and associated text file and printing at a printer. Printer is shown as printer, #45, in figure 4).

Regarding claim 20, which depends from claim 19, the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a system stored on a printing device for printing a form wherein the means for accessing form imaging data comprises an imaging extension (Al-Hussein, col 7, ln 39-51, CPU associated with imaging service controls program instruction sequences which access and manipulate document images. In figure 5, disk #75, where image and text files are stored, is interfaced with SCSI interface #76 to computer bus #61. Also see, LeClair, col 8, ln 1-3, printing commands are issued from a browser over the Internet. Also see Pennell, fig 4, wherein the browser is used for form processing. It is well known that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).



Regarding claim 21, which depends from claim 20, the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a system stored on a printing device for printing a form wherein the imaging extension comprises part of a user browser (LeClair, col 8, ln 1-3, printing commands are issued from a browser over the internet. Also see Pennell, fig 4, wherein the browser is used for form processing. It is well known in the art that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 22, which depends from claim 20, the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a system stored on a printing device for printing a form wherein the imaging extension comprises part of a network-based printing service hosted by the printing device (LeClair, col 7, ln 57-65, instructions issued to retrieve documents are sent by browser, col 8, ln 1-3, in network connected to printer (figure 3), I/O device #350 connected to network #300, browser is viewed in display #322, connected to server #310 and network. Embedded server of LeClair may host form process website as taught by Pennell. Additionally, it is well known in the art that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 23, which depends from claim 22, the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a system stored on a printing device for printing a form wherein the printing service is hosted by an embedded server of the printing device (LeClair, col 7, ln 57-65, instructions issued to retrieve documents are sent by browser, col 8, ln 1-3, which is hosted by printing device, in network connected

Art Unit: 2624

to printer figure 3, I/O device #350 connected to network #300, browser is viewed in display #322, connected to server #310 and network. Also see col 9, ln 30-34 of LeClair, wherein a print request printing the forms as taught by Yuasa, may be received by the network based printing device. It is well known in the art that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 26, which depends from claim 24, the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell further teaches a printing device wherein the logic comprises an imaging extension that is configured to access the at least one store (Al-Hussein, col 8, ln 67 and continuing to col 9, ln 1-8, program of PICS includes logic for an imaging extension configured to access at least one store, i.e. the program has capabilities to create, store, and access text files and associated image files from various storage media. Also see LeClair, col 8, ln 1-3, printing commands are issued from a browser over the internet. Also see Pennell, fig 4, wherein the browser is used for form processing. It is well known in the art that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 27, which depends from claim 24, the combination of Al-Hussein, Yuasa, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a printing system further comprising an embedded server (LeClair, col 7, ln 55-59, printer comprises an embedded server. In figure 3, server #310 may be embedded in I/O device #350. Processing occurs in server in printer to process images comprising documents and forms).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, see page 13 in 17-21, page 14, in 24-26 and page 15, in 1-4 and 9-13, filed September 26, 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Yuasa et al. (US 5878198).

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dillon J. Murphy whose telephone number is (571) 272-5945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Dillon Murphy*  
*Dillon Murphy*

**DOUGLAS Q. TRAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

*Tranabing*